



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Se

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/663,484	09/13/2000	Manojit Sarkar	1384.011US1	2760
21186	7590	04/06/2005	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				JEAN, FRANTZ B
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		2151		

DATE MAILED: 04/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/663,484	SARKAR, MANOJIT	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Frantz B. Jean	2151	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2004.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                     | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                                  |

Art Unit: 2151

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 11/12/04. claims 3-7 have been added by the 11/12/04 amendment. Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102{e} as being anticipated by Galvin US patent Number 6,298,130.

As per claim 1, Galvin teaches a computerized method for managing router metadata, the method comprising: Creating a metadata file (col. 9 lines 35 et seq), said metadata file defining objects in a router; reading the metadata file; converting (updating col. 9 lines 40 et seq) the metadata file into an object model having at least one object; and loading the objects onto the router (see col. 4 lines 15-67; col. 9 lines 14 et seq).

As per claim 4, a hash table of attributes names and attributes values is implicit in Galvin (see fig 1, elements 300-303).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galvin.

As per claim 3, Galvin does not teach a file that comprises an ASCII formatted file. This feature is well known and expected in the art at the time of the invention. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have known to use or incorporate a metadata file

that comprises an ASCII format to convert characters (such as letters, numbers, decimal etc.) into digital form, thereby, facilitating communication among computers.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galvin in view of Schoening et al US patent Number 6,226,788.

As per claim 2, Galvin does not explicitly teach loading the objects into an SNMP MIB. Schoening discloses an extensible network management system, which includes SNMP and MIB (see Schoening col. 1 lines 37 et seq). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Schoening SNMP and MIB to Galvin metadata-based network: routing because it would have improved and facilitated communication over the router and network connections (see Schoening col. 1 lines 38-42).

Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galvin in view of Nicholson et al ("Nicholson") US patent Number 6,631,519.

As per claim 5, Galvin does not explicitly detail on converting a subset of metadata into object model. Nicholson teaches this feature (see col. 7 lines 23-31). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Nicholson's to Galvin's metadata network routing in order to maintain compatibility among objects in the system.

As per claims 6-7, Galvin fails to teach comparing by the router the objects of the object model to a runtime object model and updating the runtime object model with differences identified by the comparison. Nicholson teaches these features (see col. 2 lines 5-11 and col. 1 lines 42-45). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have combined Nicholson's with Galvin's features in order to maintain compatibility among objects in the system (see Nicholson col. 1 lines 46-59).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 11/12/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Galvin does not teach converting the metadata file into an object having at least one object.

Examiner respectfully submits that while the converter engine converts incoming information to metadata, the process can also be reversed because the channel that leads to the database 300 of fig 1 is bi-directional. In other words,

file from metadata 33 can be converted into an object as desired or recommended by the system (see fig 1 for details).

***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz B. Jean whose telephone number is 571-272-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 M-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571 272 3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz Jean



FRANTZ B. JEAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER